

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
August 3, 2006**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Cope, Robert Hall (arrived at 7:35 PM), Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols (left at 9:05 PM), and David Wobker

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Senior Planner; Kerry Kriner, Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:00 PM.

MINUTES

July 6, 2006

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO ADOPT THE JULY 6, 2006 MEETING MINUTES WITH TWO REVISIONS: ON PAGE 7, 4TH BULLET POINT, CHANGE "WOULD NOT UNDERSTAND" TO "WOULD UNDERSTAND" AND ON PAGE 10, ADD A BULLET POINT UNDER MS. PROMER-NICHOLS, "WOULD VOTE AGAINST THE PROJECT DUE TO THE PRESENT DESIGN OF THE HOTEL REGARDLESS OF THE REST OF THE PROJECT." MOTION CARRIED (4-0-1), WITH MR. MADRID ABSTAINING.

APPROVAL

Avalon Redmond Place

Description: Approve colors

Location: 8935 160th Avenue NE

Greg Beeler, the applicant, gave a brief statement about the request for approval of colors for the full exterior repaint of the community, with similar colors to those used before except the accent colors for the popouts have changed. Two of the eight buildings have been painted. A third has been started but not completed. He had paint samples and pictures of the buildings as they were previously painted. They have gone with the same body color and a blue accent rather than the previous mint green accent.

Mr. Cope liked the new colors better than the previous colors.

Mr. Madrid and Mr. Wobker were fine with the proposed colors.

Mr. Meade said he does not approve of color blocking, or painting panels different colors. Colors and materials should stop at inside corners, so he thought they should wrap the colors to the inside corners.

Mr. Fischer noted that there was currently a stop work order to stop the painting.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE CURRENT PAINT SCHEME WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE PAINT COLORS ON THE FACE SHALL BE RETURNED INTO THE INSIDE CORNERS WHERE APPLICABLE ON ALL EIGHT BUILDINGS, EVEN THOSE ALREADY PAINTED. MOTION CARRIED (5-0).

APPROVAL

WestPark Campus Corridor Signage & Landscape Plan

Description: Change in Building N paint color and adjacent landscaping

Location: NE 85th Street and 154th Avenue NE

Applicant Request: Approval of change in building paint color and landscaping

Applicant: Mark Weisman with Mark Weisman Group

Prior Review Date: 5/18/06

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer / 425-556-2432

Steven Fischer, Senior Planner, presented the staff report, saying Building N of this project was reviewed by the Board earlier this year regarding removal of trees, some improvements at the corner, some pedestrian connections, and some painting. At that time, the Design Review Board strongly recommended that the project return as a Master Plan for the entire campus. The components for this review are signage, landscape, and a sidewalk. WestPark currently has a sign program that has been approved by the DRB. Carl McArthy, Code Enforcement, had informed him that the monument sign, the building identification sign, and address number signs are all permitted within the proper sign permits. There are two signs in the pictures in the packet that deal with leasing and management that are at issue with the Redmond Sign Code. The applicant is encouraged to talk with Mr. McArthy to work out these issues. The landscape plan has identified 161 significant trees on site, of which 17 have been deemed unhealthy and proposed for removal, and an additional 32 healthy significant trees have also been proposed for removal, making a total of 49 trees proposed for removal on this campus. Some of these trees proposed for removal may actually be street trees, which are governed by the City of Redmond. This can be worked out with the Parks Department. The other issue is that the Redmond Tree Preservation Code allows for no more than five significant trees to be removed per acre for the purpose of thinning heavily wooded areas. Regarding a sidewalk, the Master Plan does not address a sidewalk along the west side of 154th Avenue NE, as suggested by the DRB. Staff is recommending that the DRB approve the applicant's request for signage and tree removal with conditions. He clarified for Mr. Cope that the current placement of the leasing signs is in violation of the sight line triangle.

Mark Weisman, president of Mark Weisman Group, landscape architects, 2329 S. Madison Street, Seattle, WA 98112, clarified that the Master Plan focuses only on the corridor. He described the tree situation and their plans to improve the sight line along the corridor. For signage, they are proposing less, smaller and more elegant signage than is currently there. They will be positioned so they are not in the sight line triangles.

Dennis Dieni, JPC Architects, 1601 108th Avenue NE, Suite 2250, Bellevue, WA 98004, explained that there are some monolithic concrete signs that are not very attractive. They propose to update the signage and give the business park a cohesive identity. There are three levels of signage: larger monument signs—one on the corner of NE 85th Street and one along 154th after the trestle; the second level is wayfinding signage consisting of a smaller monument sign at the entrances; and the third level is building identification signs up towards the parapets of the buildings that will reletter the park and show the addresses. For the signs, they propose a backdrop of coated aluminum with standoff letters with a stained finish, and including the logos.

Mr. Cope wanted the applicant's feedback on the sidewalk on 154th Avenue NE, so Mr. Weisman explained that they spoke with their general contractor and learned that there are utilities, a grade issue, and the scope of the project causing difficulty in providing a sidewalk. The applicant does not intend to add a sidewalk because the expense would be huge and significant street trees would have to be sacrificed.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

MR. MADRID:

- Suggested rather than removing trees, pruning them to a more manageable state.
- Requested that the large landmark signs be uplighted. Liked the signs.
- Preferred that the applicant do a study on providing a sidewalk on the west side of the street.

MR. COPE:

- Liked the sign program. Thought they would be handsome.

MR. WOBKER:

- Liked the signs and thought they were much more sophisticated. Liked that they are reducing the number of leasing signs. Would have no problem approving the signage.
- Could not remember another applicant who wanted tree removals purely for the sake of tree removal. He would prefer that the City Council decide whether or not to remove 49 trees, 32 of them healthy, to increase visibility in a business park, especially when the western side of the business park is so heavily devoted to cars.

MR. MEADE:

- Liked the reduction of signs; the colors will be more impactful and probably draw more attention to the signs.
- Shared the concerns about tree removal. (Mr. Dieni explained that the effort is to produce a regular cadence of street trees from one end of the project to the other. Currently, there are large gaps.)
- Confirmed that the applicant will continue to paint the buildings with the approved color palette.

MS. PROMER-NICHOLS:

- Liked the sign program as shown.
- Concerned about the trees, particularly the pine trees, being removed only to open the space. Although some are unhealthy, the fact is they are removing 49 trees and replacing with 16.

MR. HALL:

- Thought the request for removal of trees was not unreasonable in a mature development.

Mr. Fischer explained that for every healthy, significant tree, the applicant must put one back in. For a tree that is not significant or is unhealthy or dying, there is no replacement requirement. The staff report notes that there are concerns about the ability of the code to allow the removal of trees just for increased visibility. The applicant through this proposed recommendation has to obtain a clearing and grading permit regardless of what the Design Review Board recommends. If the DRB approves the motion as staff recommends, for the applicant to obtain a clearing and grading permit staff will have to review this in terms of the code. In terms of issues like visibility, staff is looking for direction from the DRB if this request is appropriate or not.

The applicant is more than willing to go beyond one-to-one replacement of trees if they could be placed in a park, along the river, or where there would be tremendous public benefit. But there is not open space within the business park for more than 16. Mr. Weisman offered to walk around the park with an arborist looking at the trees on a one-by-one basis.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST FOR SIGNAGE WITH THE CONDITION THAT (1) THE APPLICANT SHALL OBTAIN A SIGN PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED SIGNAGE, (2) THE APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT CARL McARTHUR, CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER, TO DISCUSS COMPLIANCE OF THE PROPOSED SIGNAGE TO THE NEW REDMOND SIGN CODE; AND RECOMMEND REJECTION OF THE LANDSCAPE PLAN AS PRESENTED.

A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT BY MR. MADRID AND AGREED TO BY MR. WOBKER WAS TO REQUIRE THE APPLICANT TO PUT UPLIGHTS ON ALL OF THE LANDMARK SIGNS.

MOTION CARRIED (5-0-1), WITH MR. MEADE ABSTAINING.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE THE ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING WITH THE SIGNAGE AS PRESENTED IN THIS MEETING. MOTION CARRIED (5-1), WITH MR. WOBKER VOTING AGAINST THE MOTION.

APPROVAL

L050265, Sequoia Estates Apartments

Description: New construction of 20-unit apartments in two 10-unit buildings with accessory garage structures on 1.09 acres

Location: 8533 Avondale Road

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Architect: Dennis Riebe with Riebe & Associates, Inc.

Landscape Architect: Lane & Associates

Staff Contact: Kerry Kriner / 425-556-2464

Kerry Kriner, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. As part of the zoning for the site, there is a zoning concomitant agreement that has several restrictions because there is existing single-family development around the site. There is a requirement for a minimum of 20 covered parking stalls, so the applicant is proposing those in the form of garages. There is a requirement for usable open space. As part of the tree preservation requirements, the existing landmark sequoia tree on the site must be preserved. There is a requirement that the lighting must not impact surrounding uses, and the site must be fenced with a 6-foot privacy fence. There is a restriction on the size of the units and the location of the trash enclosure. The design of the building is supposed to evoke a single-family character, but there is a minimum 20-foot building separation requirement for R-12 zoning therefore the allowed density could not be achieved with a proposal including several smaller buildings. The proposal does comply with the concomitant agreement requirements except for the minimum building separation that is about three inches off, which the applicant has agreed to adjust also the applicant has agreed to move the trash enclosure to meet the required 50-foot setback from the south property line. There are issues with the proposed building materials on the southwest elevation of Building 1, particularly the blank wall between the gabled towers. Staff is recommending the incorporation of different building materials, planter boxes, trellises or other design features to break up this façade. Staff recommends approval of the site plan with seven conditions in the following categories: lighting plan, building separation, trash enclosure, blank walls, architectural elements, affordable housing, and presentation materials inconsistencies.

Dennis Riebe, Riebe & Associates, an architectural firm located at 2112 116th Avenue NE, Bellevue, WA 98004, noted that they had an arborist report indicating significant trees. The street trees were not counted as part of the significant tree count and will stay. There is a landmark sequoia tree that will be saved. Access will be right in, right out, so there will be no changes required to the traffic pattern configuration on Avondale. They have buffered parking from the neighbors with covered garages. There is a requirement that the buildings not look like a traditional apartment. By using generous amounts of articulation and modulation, they have achieved this goal. For a variety of siding materials, they are using fiber cement shingle-type siding because of its fire safety and maintenance capability factors, some horizontal siding, and also shingle siding, with cultured stone applications in other locations. There will be a six-foot site-security fence. He agreed that they should do something more intricate to the blank wall, such as window boxes and trellises, but the windows on the Avondale side are high windows, so they would not be appropriate for window boxes. Regarding the trash enclosure, he proposed that they substitute an open parking structure in the location where the existing trash enclosure is and put the trash enclosure in the location of another parking stall. Regarding the tree preservation plan on page C2, they have protected the significant trees. There is an arborvitae hedge to provide an immediate five- to six-foot ground floor buffer from the adjoining neighbors to the south that will grow to about twelve feet high. The units are all two-bedroom units in the 1,000-1,100 square foot range.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

MR. HALL:

- Thought the project was traditional but unique and has quite a bit of variety.
- Noticed that they obviously had to design the buildings around the existing trees.

MR. COPE:

- Thought this to be a very handsome project.
- Knew it was a challenge to meet the concomitant requirement to make it look like something other than an apartment complex.
- Liked that the parking is around back.
- Glad that they were required to save the trees.
- Was concerned about how the trash truck would be able to turn around.
(The applicant assured him this would be no problem.)
- Learned that the applicant would volunteer to replace the neighbors' fences; had not finalized the fence design and would be glad to work out the final design for the fence.
- Confirmed that on P6, the northwest and southwest elevations would be Hardipanel with some wood trim spaced 24 inches on center.
- Thought they did quite a nice job.
- Wanted Ms. Promer-Nichols to comment on the landscaping; not as robust as he would expect for this architectural look.
- Thought the shingles were flat-looking; thought something more three-dimensional would be better.

MR. MADRID:

- Liked the project; thought the care the applicant had taken in using the current site plan was admirable.
- Confirmed that the applicant planned to stain and maintain the fence.
- Thought the window boxes for the southeast elevation and the shake proposed a good idea. Was not clear how the applicant would work these out with staff. Thought it important to pick the locations of the window boxes wisely.

MR. WOBKER:

- Thought this was a creative use of the property.
- Appreciated that the location of the parking and the trees that would stay.
- Supported staff working with the applicant on the fence.
- Supported breaking up the southwest elevation.
- Thought the street elevations were very attractive
- Thought the colors and materials looked okay.
- Was only concerned on the parking structures in the back; only have to cut in four feet. Seems like a lot of roofing material. Thought it would take a while for the trees to grow up.
- Noted that there are no windows on the back of those buildings, so people might see nothing but gray. (Mr. Riebe mentioned that he forgot to present on page 8 that the hillside continues to rise 3-4 feet to the people's homes beyond. A lot of roofline and back wall would be hidden by the six-foot fence and the 12-feet of cedars.

MR. MEADE:

- Complimented the applicant on the project.
- Agreed that the southwest elevation of Building 1 is lacking. Had some recommendations.
- Said he had no objection to the use of Hardi-shingle, as it is a satisfactory product, although it does not exactly emulate cedar—not as much shadow and not as natural. Thought it a fair substitute.
- Thought on the southeast elevation they should include the back belly band underneath the windows into the recess and pick up shingles above that—then on the front gable bay drop that belly band down to the height of the sill on the adjacent tower and bring that around to the front. Would provide better balance.
- Commented that on Building 2 the prominent elevation as one enters the property is the southwest elevation. The hip portion above the garage looks disproportionate. They could change the slope and get more wall back to downplay the garage. There is too much roof.
- Noted that the northwest elevation between the garages had stone veneer, but there is one section without stone veneer. (The applicant explained that would be stone veneer.)
- Liked the shingle color which would slightly help show off the idea of shingle.
- Thought the body color was too tame. Encouraged the applicant to find a richer body color.

- Confirmed that the stone is Bucks County ledge stone with antique black comp.
- Considered the berming at the back of the garages a great move. Suggested glazing some of the garage doors for a little more charm.
- Wanted to make staining the fence a condition. Recommended using a dark color stain to help the fence disappear into the evergreen landscaping.
- Wanted to know if there was an opportunity to do something at the front to give a textural change and to give people an indication that they should slow down and respect the property and people who live there. Suggested a patterned paving material. (Mr. Riebe replied that they would need to have Public Works go along with this because the department has so many utilities there.

MS. PROMER-NICHOLS:

- Liked the project.
- Suggested on the southwest elevation having windows for the bathrooms to get some fresh air to the bathrooms.
- Suggested putting in a schedule of some grasses/perennials that could be sprinkled throughout to emphasize the residential character.
- Said she hates arborvitaes and the applicant has rows of them along Avondale. Thought they could find something better for the prominent location along Avondale.
- Noted that there is no programmed open space in this development; inquired if the applicant is considering putting in any open space. (Mr. Riebe replied that the best he could do is have a nicely landscaped walk through the center court. There is not room for benches and other accessories because of the five-foot drip line for the significant trees' protection.)

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L050265, SEQUOIA ESTATES APARTMENTS, SITE PLAN, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, COLORS, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPE PLAN AND LIGHTING PLAN WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Lighting Plan.** The Lighting Plan is subject to the approval of the Technical Review Committee. The lighting fixture cut sheets shall be provided by the applicant to the City of Redmond for review.
2. **Building Separation.** The minimum building separation under the R-12 site requirements is 20 feet and must be met by this proposal.
3. **Trash Enclosure.** The proposed trash enclosure must be located a minimum of 50 feet from the west and south property lines. The location must be approved by the Technical Committee prior to Civil Plan approval and Waste Management prior to building permit approval.
4. **Blank Walls.** The southwest elevation of Building I must incorporate different materials for the wall section between the gabled towers and window planters with decorative brackets and trellises with associated planting to break up the blank wall façade. The applicant should utilize the comments of the Design Review Board and work those out with staff. If staff deems necessary, the applicant should return to the Design Review Board.
5. **Architectural Elements.** All building elevations for Buildings 1 and 2 shall incorporate randomly spaced window planters with decorative brackets to assist in breaking up the bulk and scale of the facades and meet the intent of the zoning concomitant by evoking single-family character.
6. **Affordable Housing.** As a condition of Site Plan Entitlement approval and in compliance with the zoning concomitant agreement, two of the apartment units must be designated as affordable.
7. **Presentation Materials Inconsistencies**
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11" x 17" submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.

8. If possible, the Design Review Board would like to have a textured paving at the entry of a pedestrian variety, conditioned upon acceptance by the City of Redmond Public Works Department.
 9. Require garage door glazing on the northwest corner garage.
 10. The new cedar fence shall be stained, and the landscape palette shall include additional plants of a residential nature, including perennials and grasses, and that can be worked out with staff.
- MOTION CARRIED (6-0).**

(Ms. Promer-Nichols left the meeting at 9:05 p.m. Mr. Cope presided over the remainder of the meeting.)

APPROVAL

L060284, Cleveland Street West

Description: Mixed-use residential development of approximately 135 flats and approximately 6,000 sf of retail/commercial at street level

Location: 15955 Redmond Way

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Applicant: Cleveland Street West LLC

Prior Review Date(s): 03/02/06 and 05/18/06

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425-556-2418

Steven Fischer presented the staff report, stating that this project in the Old Town design district. He noted that on page 10 there are four items requiring approval for deviation, and staff recommends approval of three of these requests for deviation. The fourth one regarding a deviance in the balconies is more difficult. Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Dianna Broadie, Senior Planner, spoke about windows. She handed out copies of the regulations, showing a height-to-width ratio. The applicant is requesting administrative relief from that. Staff has agreed to this to some degree by the proposed grid. She pointed out where the window design did not necessarily meet staff's intent. They did bring in east elevation elements that are recessed fairly deeply, and they might be acceptable. The other ones are on prominent corner facades and are not acceptable in those locations. Staff also does not think the horizontal window is acceptable. She provided some alternatives that met the intent of a historic district.

Peter Greaves with Weber + Thompson Architects, 425 Pontius Ave, Seattle, WA 98118, presented for the applicant, highlighting the changes they have made based on the requests of the Design Review Board at the last review. The first change was to a more traditional cornice, and they have added awnings over openings on top of the decks. The second was to delete the sloped roof on the section where the roof was canted at an angle; this was flattened to be at the same plane. The third change was to modify window breakups. The applicant's representatives met with Planning staff to provide a more neutral quality to the corner of the building. The fourth issue was to clarify deck areas and the access; they have enlarged a number of the decks so that over 50 percent of the decks have a minimum dimension of five feet. The last item was to pay some attention to enhancing the pedestrian realm on the south side of the trail. They have added a series of screening elements that come up from the grounds and a series of planters. The architect handed out a detailed description of proportions of the cornice and where the siding was used both in detail and noted in the elevations.

Mike Kleer, Weisman Design Group, 2329 S Madison Street, Seattle, WA 98112, presented a summary of the landscape plan.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

MR. HALL:

- Felt very comfortable with the modifications made by the applicant.
- Expressed his support for the project as presented at this meeting.
- Said he tended to think that the historical aspect should not be taken to the extremes. Was concerned about holding them to historic windows.
- Was concerned about the change in the entry space, or marquee. Suggested going back to something more of what they had before. What they are now proposing seems too contemporary compared to what is going on at the ground level, especially on the east elevation.
- Had no problem with the balcony doors.

MR. MADRID:

- Said he remains enthusiastic about the project overall.
- Agreed about the comment on the front façade and entry, but thought the drawing does not do justice to the shadow lines.
- Agreed with staff that the horizontal windows need to be changed. The applicant should work out an appropriate substitute with staff.
- Liked the screens and confirmed that evergreen vines would be used to grow up the screens.
- Thought the project had evolved well.
- Appreciated the time the applicant had spent doing the massing studies and the 3-D on the project.
- Thought all the balconies should come to the code standards. The 40-square-foot balconies are not big enough.

MR. WOBKER:

- Said he is very supportive of this project and liked it very much.
- Did not think the west elevation was strong enough; not as attractive as the others; but the one people would see the most as they come into Redmond. Suggested incorporating the strengths of the other three elevations into the west elevation. (The applicant reminded him that the west elevation is 30 feet away from another building at a certain point. There had been agreement to concentrate their detail efforts where they had the most effect on the pedestrian realm and the community.)
- Liked the materials.

MR. MEADE:

- Shared Mr. Wobker's comments about the west elevation. Thought that as the building turns the corner there is a need to unify the elevation by carrying that volume in some way whether colored pattern or material. Suggested bringing the vertical bay around the corner.
- Commented that the elevations are not doing the brick any justice.
- Noted that there were no lintels on the second floor.
- Confirmed that the deck rail material is vertical metal in a dark color, probably black.
- Wanted to know if there was an opportunity to connect some of the canvas canopies at the street level. Recommended connecting some of these to change the rhythm and thought the different column widths would benefit from the interruption.
- Confirmed that the cornice would be made of wood.
- Commented that the window package is a little chaotic. Thought glazing is represented well in the historic photos, even though that may not have been typical of historic Redmond. There should be continuity in window solutions. Did not see this in the applicant's window solutions—saw asymmetrical windows, windows that are fully gridded, and some that are partially gridded. Thought this building could be better unified as far as the windows are concerned. This would not affect his vote at this point, but if this were a preapplication he would ask for something more unified.
- Suggested an evergreen vine for the screening vine. (The applicant replied that they would do mostly evergreen vines, but also a few deciduous vines to get more flowers.)
- Suggested creating some kind of built-up trim detail at the bottom of the cantilevered bay to give a more historic look. Historically, there was not the technology for cantilevering. The trims would make the bays look as if they are supported rather than cantilevered.

MR. COPE:

- Liked the project very much.
- Appreciated the applicant's responsiveness from the last meeting; the project is richer because of it.
- Liked the materials and colors very much.
- Had always liked the hardscape and landscaping—very urban and what would be best along Cleveland. Has been done well.
- Understood about the windows and also the meaning and the intent of the design guidelines of the code, but wanted the applicant to work on the windows some more. A horizontal window does not work. The windows are not quite there yet. Said he does not need to see the windows again unless an agreement cannot be reached.
- Agreed with others about the entry.
- Wanted an explanation about the balconies that are below code. (The applicant explained that they cannot fully cantilever a metal balcony five feet and they want a variety.) To him, a 4-foot balcony is not workable.
- Found a number of designations in the table on page 43 that were not shown on the elevations; e.g., 6, 7, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20. The elevations do not match the legend. (The applicant said that all of those materials are someplace on the drawings.)
- Liked the landscape solution of the vines on the screening; liked flowering vines. This is an important elevation—the more flowering, the better.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE CONDITIONALLY L060284, CLEVELAND STREET WEST, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, COLORS, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPE PLAN, AND LIGHTING PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. Building elevations for the building permit set shall be scaled at 1/8" and shall show all cladding materials. Additional details at 1/4" or larger may be required during building permit review to ensure that the cladding materials meet the design standards for the district and expectations of this conditional approval.
2. The deviations from the following standards are approved per the plans reviewed by the Design Review Board April 6, 2006 per RCDG 20C.40.40-03 Administrative Design Flexibility:
 - a. Allow guest parking stalls to be counted toward parking requirement for retail uses.
 - b. Allow projections (balconies) to project closer than 5 feet to the property line (along 160th Avenue NE). The balconies would project up to the property line in some areas.
 - c. Allow the modulation standards to be waived, with the use of architectural emphasis on prominent building corners.
 - d. Allow applicant's stated elevations for the balconies as long as 50 percent remain 5 feet deep and allow patios to be less than 5 feet in width when double French doors or double sliding doors providing at least 5 feet of opening width are used on these smaller balconies.
3. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11" x 17" submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.
4. Work with staff to change and/or modulate the windows to come up to historic standards.
5. Work with staff to help modulate the west elevation to break up the continuity.
6. On page 43, the elevations do not match the legend and that should be clarified. Staff shall work with the applicant to make sure the legend and the elevations match.
7. Will incorporate material or banding on the cantilevered section to make that more harmonious.
8. The marquee on the east side of the building must be modified to correspond with what was originally presented.

9. On the east and north elevations, some of the awnings must be grouped together rather than positioned individually, and the applicant should work with staff on that.
MOTION CARRIED (5-0).

Mr. Meade requested larger scale drawings on future projects.

CONSULTATION

L050181, Shaughnessy Heights

Description: Division of 17.42 acres into 73 single-family lots containing 53 single-family detached homes and 20 attached (duplex) homes by means of a subdivision (File #L050180) and planned residential development (File #L050181)

Location: 8420 167th Ave NE

Architect: Ian Guan with Robert Ciccozzi Architecture

Landscape Architect: Jason Walker with Talasaea Consultants

Applicant: Grant Gillies

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer / 425-556-2432

Steven Fischer presented the staff report, explaining this is not a typical Planned Residential Development application as it is not all single-family, but a combination of single-family duplexes and two triplexes. The triplex is what brings this project to the Design Review Board. This is a contemporary design on a prominent hillside overlooking downtown and just above Redmond Elementary School. This particular design tries to take advantage of the views of downtown by locating the living areas on the third floor. Although they are described as earthy, staff has not seen color samples. Trash will be handled on an individual basis. Staff has concern about the repetitive nature of the rear elevation of the triplex. The single-family and duplex residence designs are in there for context rather than review by the Design Review Board.

Robert Ciccozzi, 200-2335 Columbia Street, Vancouver, BC, described the project, saying they would be using rich materials, such as cedar siding and concrete. He announced that they have decided to change the complex so there are no longer triplexes. He invited comments anyway.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

MS. PROMER-NICHOLS (written comments);

- Liked the direction the project was going.
- Thought they had a nice site plan.
- Liked the architecture style.
- Thought there was an interesting mix of materials.
- Considered the uphill single-family buildings too repetitive; there might be an opportunity for variation, possibly by flipping the buildings.
- Could imagine families living in the units since the school is so near, and questioned how are the open spaces going to accommodate children who cannot go down to the school on their own.

MR. COPE:

- Thought this a handsome project.
- Liked the approach taken with the architecture and design.
- Liked the materials.
- Recommended that the high windows be operable, if not already planned for that.

MR. MADRID:

- Considered the design interesting and refreshing.
- Recommended having screened areas for the trash cans, so they cannot be seen from the street.

MR. WOBKER:

- Thought the design looked very Coloradoish.
- Liked the project; thought it very handsome.

MR. MEADE:

- Commented that they have an extraordinary project.
- Concerned that they are so repetitive that they would be difficult to sell.
- Suggested that the architect play with the floor plans and come up with some more iterations for variety. (Mr. Fischer reinforced that people want their own identity, so encouraged further exploration.)
- Was amazed at how one could enter the duplex from both sides.

MR. HALL:

- Suggested that certain duplex units be oriented toward the views.
- Liked the concrete elements that run throughout the entire complex.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. WOBKER TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 10:15 PM. MOTION CARRIED (5-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060006, Riverpark

Description: Proposal includes one hotel, one condominium building, one office building and one apartment building on 6.1 acres

Location: NE 78th Street and 159th Place NE

Applicant: Scott Mackay

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer / 425-556-2432

Steven Fischer presented the staff report for this fourth preapplication meeting to include a discussion of green design standards, the final drawings of Buildings A and B, showing increased deck width, elevations for Building E, and a new design and elevations for the hotel, Building C.

Kerry Nicholson, Legacy Partners, 2122 Alki Ave SW #200, Seattle, WA 98116, introduced the speakers and gave a summary of what would be presented. They would discuss some of the green building strategies and a brief orientation on the master plan that the DRB members have already seen a number of times, and then landscaping-related issues. They had material boards for each building and showed the recent improvements related to previous DRB comments and how these buildings relate to each other.

Bob Tiscareno, 500 Union Street, #420, Seattle, WA 98101, stated that there were no changes from the previous site plan. They had a summary of green design concepts that showed how the office building recognizes the pedestrian zone on Riverpark Drive in that northwest corner and how it steps down at the entry, and the overall landscape concept with the building that is set back on 159th Place NE.

Matt Porteous, landscape architect, 119 Pine Street, Seattle, WA 98101, presented the improvements to the site plan landscaping. They reoriented the stairs toward the park in a different manner. They now have a stronger pedestrian connection to the park parking area. The 159th Place NE entry will have added buffer along the back of the sidewalk to further provide pedestrians a safety zone behind the sidewalk. An added feature is a water element tying in with several other water elements throughout the site plan. There is potential for a plaza space with seating. The trees in this area would be a high canopy, finely textured tree that would be on a fairly regimented grid pattern with a fairly strict underplanting of a textural pattern change using hostas, ferns, and other Northwest contemporary plants. He referenced page 9.

Ray Johnston spoke about the changes to A/B residential building stepbacks and materials for Building E. Along the north side of Building B they have altered rhythm of the brick and glass

façade, and have shrunk the opening to the garage to make it a pedestrian opening. They have expanded the evolution of the boardwalk and courtyard. The upper floors are setback an additional foot from where they were before. There have been some structural tweaks that add a European lane feel. Water cascading from above will flow over this curved wall garage into a receiver to make an interesting and active inner alley for the project. They are adding some arbors and flanking the lower terrace of the courtyard with water, fire, Zen garden, hot tub, barbecues and less porous walls. They have expanded the stair into the park and added planting on both sides of it above and below. They have simplified some of the glazing. They are trying to use similar, compatible, but different materials for Building E compared to Building A/B. They will use a brown/red brick, stained wood, corrugated metal in both solid and perforated styles, and aluminum windows. If possible, they will use ground source heating and cooling using the river aquifer.

Jeff Krebel presented the changes for the hotel. There were previous concerns about the blank walls, especially on the four ends of the buildings, so they have redesigned the units on the four ends of the building. They have improved the trash area. They kept the stairs in the same location, but they developed a brick mass anchored by a glass-enclosed stair. They have more strongly identified the hotel entry with a concrete element with a projecting canopy. There is additional landscaping around the trash area to add more screening. The upper level has metal fascias with projecting windows. The balconies are basically wood. At the access for the garage, they have made a grilled pattern with the same type of railing that will be used on the balcony railings. There is a predominant concrete base around the entire building with stone lintels at all the openings and a varied use of brick. They would like to introduce a sign element at the corner of the building to be a focal point entering the site.

Jay Kim, Callison, presented the improvements to the office building, which will have the Group Health Clinic occupying the second floor. Responding to the DRB concern about the north elevation, they have improved it by accentuating the corner. Their strategy for the sustainability factor was to eliminate the sunshades on the north and add them on the south and west. The east elevation has not changed much. On the west elevation, there is a bigger corner element. The first floor will be a brick base, the second floor precast or possibly a lighter brick, and the upper floor metal and glass.

Scott MacKay, 1300 NE 65th Street, Seattle, WA 98115, explained that they are beginning to do subtle communications between the buildings. There is a lot of vertical/horizontal play, weather protection for the pedestrians, and four retail areas around the central pedestrian court. The idea is to create the court as a lively environment with tables and chairs, people doing things, and active retail facades. The stepbacks are larger. There is syncopation. The concept with the water features is that the water pulls the pedestrian down and through the courtyard. The traffic is pushed to the outside perimeter. There are moveable wood shutters that give randomness to the façade. There are tilted roofs with natural wood eaves beneath. There will be a metal line in the pavement that indicates division between the public Luke McRedmond Park property and the private Riverpark property.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

MR. HALL:

- Appreciated the additional information provided by the applicant.
- Supported the way the project is evolving.
- Commented that he had resigned himself to the shape of the hotel and thought it was becoming a much more successful building. Liked how the elevations evolved and the retail in the corner becoming a restaurant with its own separate entry.
- Thought the idea of doubling up the use of the breakfast bar as a cocktail lounge or bar in the evening would be smart to provide activity to that corner.

- Commented that, since the office building as the corner is activated, they might consider taking the first 30 feet back from the edge of the building and creating a retail opportunity. Looks like there should be a secondary function there besides Group Health.
- Thought Building E to be a very exciting building—not clear what function will be.
- Commented that on sheets 23-24 the northeast corner is becoming more opened up—wondered if maybe a portion should be exterior walkways around the elevator lobby. Need weather protection on that corner for the top floor.

MR. MADRID:

- Liked the direction the project is moving.
- Thought that the northeast corner of Building D needs more articulation or sun shading to break up the corner and make it as interesting as the northwest corner—seems too plain.
- Liked the way the residential buildings are going. They are exciting. The hotel is going in the right direction.
- Acknowledged that the boardwalk on the west side of Building A/B is still a work in progress, but was curious how that works out—more or less prominent. The interface with the park is a large concern of the DRB. Encouraged them to make this playful but still part of the park, so it does not feel as if one is jumping from the park to something brand new.
- Noted that some of the elevations do not reflect that the main entrance on 159th Place NE and Riverpark Drive has changed.
- Thought Building D was the only one needing further work.

MR. WOBKER:

- Liked the materials and colors presented and especially liked the addition of the wood.
- Pleased with how the hotel has evolved. The hotel was his main concern because that is the most prominent thing coming into the city. Thought it looked incredibly better at both ends now than before.
- Emphasized that the fire lane doubled as a sidewalk; not vice versa. Understood the tradeoffs, but still not happy with that. Page 14 shows the commercial being used in the park, so does not do a favor to the project.
- Clarified on page 15 that the long hallway that curves behind the retail there is access to the public bathrooms. Thought the bathrooms should be very well signed. Thought the parking lot for the park would become a de facto parking lot for the restaurant.
- Suggested taking out the one umbrella showing in park land on page 43. Make sure everyone understands that park land is not going to be used for commercial.
- Considered the project a wonderful addition to the city.

MR. MEADE:

- Thought the evolution of the project to be phenomenal.
- Considered the first iteration of Building E very successful.
- Commented that the evolution of the hotel exceeds what he anticipated seeing this time; was by far the most difficult building of the group in previous reviews. Now it is a jewel, and he is very impressed. Thought the direction of the hotel to be extraordinary.
- Liked the facades for Building D. Liked the idea of including retail. Thought the light-colored brick would help. Did not see this building evolving. There is a lot of opportunity here to do something more extraordinary. Suggested that they explore rooflines, the way they break up the mass, and try to add some appeal on the street for this building. The whole building needs more detail and thought. Currently, appears as only glass and a bit of brick. Hoped the next iteration of this building would be as evolved as the other buildings.
- Thought the site plan had gotten better. The connection with the park is becoming more sensitive to that situation.
- Thought Buildings A, B, C, and E are ready to move on. Building D needs further refinement to the skin—mostly on the north and west elevations.

MS. PROMER-NICHOLS (written comments):

- Thought the project was generally going in the right direction.
- Liked the improvements to the west elevation of Buildings A/B with increased balconies and setbacks.
- Considered that the office building still needs help along 159th Place NE—an outdoor patio, some sort of people place, a sculpture, animation, etc. Currently looks like a building in an office park where no one would ever walk by. Need to enliven the streetscape; need to do this with more than trees and shrubs.
- Commented that the hotel is definitely better with the architectural language more in keeping with the rest of the site. Continued not to like the east elevation and how it relates to the entire site. Would prefer any way that the architecture can notch out the southeast corner at the first floor (breakfast room) so the pedestrians can look through the corner into the heart of the site.
- Agreed with Steve's comment about the entry. Elevations shown make it look pretty sterile. Retail looks very similar to the residential spaces on the east elevation, and neither feels very pedestrian friendly. Concerned about the south elevation—a lot of blank walls. What happens if apartments are torn down? Would leave a pretty ugly neighbor.

MR. COPE:

- Appreciated the responses to his comments about green design and sustainability. Thought they took those seriously and have made very good responses.
- Questioned the sewage lagoon mentioned on page 9. (Mr. Fischer responded that this site and the park are a former sewage lagoon restored by the City.)
- Requested that at next review they show the locations of the close proximities to public transportation.
- Wanted to know how they would monitor construction and recycling waste management. (The applicant responded that all contractors will have waste management control systems in place. There will be some salvage of usable materials from the teardown of the current buildings on the site.) Requested that as they move forward they revisit the list of waste management because he is concerned about how this will get done. Want this to be monitored.
- Agreed with Mr. Wobker that they should redo the rendering on page 14. Do not have diners sitting in the park.
- Noticed on page 19 that all the buildings on one side of the street had precast concrete bases and those on the other side did not. (The applicant preferred this look.)
- Glad to see Building E and thought they awarded the contract to the right architect.
- Noted that there was a lack of detail in the drawings regarding the water feature. (The applicant responded that they are currently working with the Fire Department on the stair climb. They will include these details in the drawings as soon as they can.)
- Echoed the comments about the hotel; thought it had come a long way.
- Confirmed that the metal on the top floor is corrugated.
- Was not keen on the stucco colors because they do not seem in the right family with all the other buildings or even with the design of that building. Liked the stucco material.
- Thought they had done a good job on the entry corner of the office building on page 39, and it begs retail to enrich that building. (The applicant pointed out the grade problem, but promised extremely attractive landscaping.)
- Considered that the office building had come a long way, and he liked it much better. The entry façade is much better.
- Appreciated the drawings that pointed out the relationships between the buildings.
- Liked the site plan.
- Thought the residential Buildings A/B were good.
- Thought Building E needs one or two more iterations.
- Considered Building D as more accepted, but needs a little more tweaking. Was happy with it.

Mr. Fischer recommended the project as being ready for Site Plan Entitlement. Next time the Design Review Board reviews this, the applicant will be seeking approval. Staff will place them near the beginning on the September 7 agenda.

Mr. Cope suggested a consistency in the way the building and landscaping materials are presented would be helpful.

Mr. Meade requested larger scale drawings or vignettes of larger pieces of the buildings.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. WOBKER TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 12:04 PM. MOTION CARRIED (5-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY